Modulation-Specific Multiuser Transmit Precoding and User Selection for BPSK Signalling

Majid Bavand, *Student Member, IEEE,* Steven D. Blostein, *Senior Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1603.04812v2 [cs.IT] 7 Oct 2016

Abstract

Motivated by challenges to existing multiuser transmission methods in a low signal to noise ratio (SNR) regime, and emergence of massive numbers of low data rate ehealth and internet of things (IoT) devices, in this paper we show that it is beneficial to incorporate knowledge of modulation type into multiuser transmit precoder design. Particularly, we propose a transmit precoding (beamforming) specific to BPSK modulation, which has maximum power efficiency and capacity in poor channel conditions. To be more specific, in a multiuser scenario, an objective function is formulated based on the weighted sum of error probabilities of BPSK modulated users. Convex optimization is used to transform and solve this ill-behaved non-convex minimum probability of error (MPE) precoding problem. Numerical results confirm significant performance improvement. We then develop a low-complexity user selection algorithm for MPE precoding. Based on line packing principles in Grassmannian manifolds, the number of supported users is able to exceed the number of transmit antennas, and hence the proposed approach is able to support more simultaneous users compared with existing multiuser transmit precoding methods.

Index Terms

Broadcast channels, convex optimization, Grassmannian manifolds, line packing, minimum probability of error, scheduling, transmit beamforming.

Part of this work was presented at 49th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers, Pacific Grove, CA, November 2015.

The authors are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Queen's University, Ontario, Canada, K7L 3N6 (e-mail: {m.bavand, steven.blostein}@queensu.ca).

I. Introduction

Wireless multiple input multiple output (MIMO) channels have been attracting a great deal of interest in the last decades [1]–[4]. MIMO technologies, at the core of several wireless standards, improve spectral efficiency and reliability compared to single-input single-output (SISO) systems. MIMO system design has been usually posed under two different perspectives: either to increase data transmission rate through spatial multiplexing or to improvement system reliability through increased antenna diversity. Spatial multiplexing is a simple MIMO transmit technique that it does not require channel state information (CSI) at the transmitter and enables high spectral efficiency by splitting the incoming data into multiple independent substreams and transmitting each substream on a different antenna as in V-BLAST [1]. When CSI is available at the transmitter, channel-dependent linear or nonlinear transmit precoding (beamforming) of the data substreams can further improve the performance by adapting the transmitted signal to the instantaneous channel state [5]. In this case, employing multiuser MIMO techniques allows for a gain in sum capacity obtained by channel reuse [2]–[4], [6].

Although channel reuse for multiple users is advantageous in terms of throughput, when multiple uncoordinated links share a common communications medium, e.g., in a broadcast system, co-channel interference caused by the transmission of multiple users' data on the same carrier frequency could limit channel reuse [7]. Most wireless systems avoid interference by orthogonalizing the communication links in time or frequency. It is clear that this approach could be suboptimal since it entails a priori loss of degrees of freedom in both links independent of the amount of interference. Power control, precoding, and scheduling techniques, with capability of reducing interference, are conventional solutions to the co-channel interference problem [4]. From a practical point of view, using multiple antennas to communicate with many users simultaneously is especially appealing in wireless local area network (WLAN) environments, WiMAX, and other time-division duplex (TDD) systems where channel conditions can readily be learned by all parties [3].

Classically, a beamformer or precoder controls the beam pattern of an antenna array by weighting antennas to satisfy predetermined optimization criteria. Many precoding methods aim at maximizing throughput. However, as pointed out by Palomar et al. [8], the problem with this type of criterion is that it implicitly presumes that an unrealizable ideal continuous Gaussian code

is used instead of a signal constellation. In practice, the transmitter sends a modulated signal with a practical suboptimal channel coding scheme which together determine system throughput. Signal to noise ratio (SNR), signal to interference plus noise ratio (SINR), mean square error (MSE) between the desired signal and the array output, and signal to leakage ratio (SLR) are other common criteria in formulating the precoding optimization problem [2], [3], [6]. However, in the communications scenario considered here, the probability of error or achievable bit error rate (BER) is the system performance metric that maximizes capacity for BPSK transmission [9]–[13]. Therefore, designing the transmit precoder to directly minimize the error probability would result in improved system performance.

The error probability of each user in a multiuser downlink system depends on the modulation type. Therefore, to design a precoder that minimizes error probability, one ought to account for the modulation type which is not considered in classical precoding methods such as minimum mean square error (MMSE), maximum signal to leakage and noise ratio (MSLNR), and block diagonalization (BD) [14]. In this paper, it is established that by incorporating modulation type in the precoder design, system performance may be significantly improved.

As additional motivation, low data rate BPSK modulation is a commonly employed transmission mode in adaptive wireless systems such as IEEE 802.11a,n,ac, when SNR is low [15], [16]. Moreover, emerging technologies such as internet of things (IoT) require simultaneous deployment of a massive number of low data rate devices, which serves as another motivation for employing BPSK modulation [17]. Finally, in current WiFi systems such as 802.11ac, the transmit precoding is considered as a selectable adaptive "MIMO mode" in addition to modulation type, which naturally motivates coupling of transmit precoding to modulation.

As mentioned earlier, selecting a subset of users for transmission in a broadcast channel, is another conventional method to reduce co-channel interference and increase system throughput and reliability. Gains in throughput and reliability are also obtained by multiuser diversity via user selection when the number of users is large. Although the optimal user subset can be found by brute-force search over all possible combinations of user subsets, its computational complexity is prohibitive. In practice, low-complexity scheduling algorithms are desired [4], [18]–[22]. For example in [4], [18], algorithms based on semi-orthogonal user selection (SUS) are presented, which are developed for zero-forcing precoding. When SUS is combined with zero-forcing precoding and water filling power allocation, although overall suboptimal, it can

achieve the same asymptotic (high SNR) sum rate as that of dirty paper coding for broadcast channel, as the number of users goes to infinity. In [19], a greedy user selection algorithm is proposed based on BD precoding and increases total throughput of users. In this paper, we propose a user selection algorithm for MPE precoding that semi-greedily selects the set of users by a geometric approach such that the number of selected users is made as large as possible. It is shown that for a one-dimensional modulation such as binary phase-shift keying (BPSK), it is possible to utilize extra dimensions provided by the complex channel and transmit information at the same time and frequency to more users than the number of transmit antennas.

The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

1) A new multiuser transmit precoder that minimizes the probability of error is proposed for BPSK signalling in the multiuser multiple input single output (MISO) broadcast channel for the following scenarios: (i) single-user maximum likelihood detection at the receivers, and (ii) joint transmit precoding and receive filtering.
2) A low-complexity geometric user selection (GUS) algorithm is developed for MPE transmit precoding, which can select more simultaneous users than the number of transmit antennas.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: in Section II, the system model is introduced. In Section III, the error probability of a user in the downlink of a multiuser system is calculated assuming the transmitter is using BPSK modulation and linear precoding for transmission. Section IV presents the minimum probability of error (MPE) transmit precoding considering two different scenarios. First, it is assumed that the receiver uses a single-user maximum likelihood detector. Second, it is assumed that the transmit precoding weights and the receive filter coefficients are calculated jointly at the transmitter. In both scenarios we try to transform the precoding optimization problem to convex optimization subproblems and present algorithms for finding the precoding vectors of users. In Section V, by taking a geometric approach, a user selection algorithm compatible with MPE precoding is presented. Numerical results are demonstrated in Section VI. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section VII.

II. System Model

We consider a broadcast system with one transmitter and K receivers (users). Later in Section V, it is shown that these K users are preselected out of K_T total available users by the proposed algorithm in Section V. The system model is shown in Fig. 1. It is assumed that the transmitter



Fig. 1. System model.

consists of an array of antennas with M elements and each receiver $j,\ 1 \leq j \leq K$, has one antenna in its array. It is also assumed that the transmitter has one symbol encoded in s_j for each receiver j, $1 \leq j \leq K$ to be transmitted in the same time and frequency slots. The transmitter uses an $M \times 1$ precoding vector $\mathbf{u}_j$ to encode the transmitted symbols intended for receiver j. Ignoring the noise at the transmitter's output, and assuming that the transmitter has information symbols for all of the K preselected receivers we can model the $M \times 1$ transmitted signal vector as

$$\mathbf{x} = \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{u}_l s_l = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{s},$$

where $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1,\ \cdots,\ \mathbf{u}_K]$ and $\mathbf{s} = [s_1, \ldots, s_K]^T$. The channel matrix between M antennas of the transmitter and the single antenna of receiver j can be represented by the $1 \times M$ vector $\mathbf{h}_j$ with entries following an independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) circularly symmetric complex Gaussian (CSCG) distribution with zero mean and unit variance. This channel model is valid for narrow-band (frequency non-selective) systems if the transmit and receive antennas are in non line-of-sight rich-scattering environments with sufficient antenna spacing [18], [23]. It should be remarked that we follow the same vector representation of the channel as [4], i.e., representing the channels with row vectors in MISO systems. At receiver j the received signal can be modeled as

$$r_j = \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{x} + z_j = \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_l + z_j = \bar{r}_j + z_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq K,$$

where z_j is a CSCG noise with zero mean and variance σ_z^2.

At receiver j the received signal is processed by a filter. Therefore the output at the receiver

j can be written as

$$y_j = y_j(w_j, \mathbf{U}) = w_j r_j = \sum_{l=1}^{K} w_j \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_l + w_j z_j = \bar{y}_j + z'_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq K,$$

where w_j is the complex-valued filter coefficient at receiver j and $z'_j = w_j z_j$ is complex Gaussian noise with variance $\sigma_z^2 w_j w_j^H$. We also express y_j as a function of w_j and $\mathbf{U}$ to emphasize its dependence on these parameters.

III. Error Probability

To calculate the error probability of each user in a broadcast channel one needs to know the estimation technique that the receiver is using in addition to the modulation type. Motivated by the facts that a low dimensional modulation like BPSK is employed in wireless systems such as IEEE 802.11a,n,ac, and it is often selected in systems with adaptive modulation when SNR is low, we assume BPSK modulation for all users [15], [16]. It is also assumed that the system operates with the following decision rule for estimating the transmitted symbols of user j when the output noise is additive white Gaussian:

$$\hat{s}_j = \mathrm{sign}(y_j^R),$$

where the superscript ^{R} denotes taking the real part operation, i.e., $x^R = \mathrm{Re}\{x\}$.

Here, the error probability of each user $j,\ 1 \leq j \leq K$, is calculated as a function of its receive filter coefficient and its transmit precoding weight vector as well as the transmit precoding weight vectors of all other users ($P_{e_j}(w_j; \mathbf{U}),\ 1 \leq j \leq K$). Later in Section IV, we use this probability of error to calculate precoding weights for two different scenarios, namely, a scenario in which each receiver estimates the transmitted signal according to a classical single-user maximum likelihood scheme without relying on knowledge of other channels, and a scenario with joint transmit precoding and receive filtering in which both of the receive filtering and transmit precoding weights are calculated at the transmitter and then the calculated receive filter coefficient of each user is provided to its receiver via the forward channel.

The error probability at the output of receiver j is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e_j} &= P_{e_j}(y_j; w_j, \mathbf{U}) = P(\hat{s}_j \neq s_j) \\ &= P_0 P(\hat{s}_j = 1 | s_j = -1) + P_1 P(\hat{s}_j = -1 | s_j = 1) \\ &= P(\hat{s}_j = -1 | s_j = 1) = P(y_j^R < 0 | s_j = 1), \end{aligned}$$

where $P_0 = P(s_j = -1)$, $P_1 = P(s_j = +1)$, and $P(.)$ is the probability of an event. It is assumed that $P_0 = P_1 = 1/2$, i.e., the transmitted BPSK modulated signal s_j takes its elements from the set $\{\pm 1\}$ with equal probability, which could be the result of source compression and hard decision. It should be remarked that, using uniform rather than Gaussian distribution over signal sets causes an asymptotic loss in throughput which could be compensated to some extent by using constellation shaping techniques [16]. The symmetry in the estimation of $+1$ and -1 for user j is also considered, which is the result of the symmetry between $p(y_j^R | s_j = -1)$ and $p(y_j^R | s_j = +1)$, where p is the probability density function (pdf), and consequently results in $P(\hat{s}_j = -1 | s_j = +1) = P(\hat{s}_j = +1 | s_j = -1)$. Since the number of constellation points in BPSK is two, $N_b = 2^K$ is the number of possible symbol sequences for all K users in one transmission, i.e., there could be 2^K different possible sets of K-tuple symbols $\mathbf{s}_b,\ 1 \leq b \leq N_b$, for K users. For BPSK transmission, we denote $N_{pb} = 2^{K-1}$ as the number of possible symbol sequences for transmission if the transmitted symbol of user j is already known for example to be $+1$.

Using equal probability for transmission of BPSK constellation points, and additive Gaussian output noise $\mathrm{Re}\{\mathrm{z}_\mathrm{j}'\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & p(y_j^R | s_j = +1) \\ &= \frac{1}{N_{pb}} \sum_{s_{l \neq j} \in \{\pm 1\}} p(y_j^R | s_1, \ldots, s_j = +1, s_{j+1}, \ldots, s_K) \\ &= \frac{1}{N_{pb}} \sum_{\substack{b=1 \\ s_j \neq -1}}^{N_{pb}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi \sigma_z^2 w_j^H w_j}} \exp - \frac{(y_j^R - \bar{y}_{j,b}^R(w_j, \mathbf{U}))^2}{\sigma_z^2 |w_j|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first equality, using total probability theorem, the conditional output probability at receiver j is again conditioned over all 2^{K-1} possible assignments of transmitted symbols $s_{l \neq j}$. Also $\bar{y}_{j,b}^R(w_j, \mathbf{U})$ is $\mathrm{Re}\{\bar{y}_j\}$ when $\mathbf{s}_b$ is transmitted, i.e.,

$$\bar{y}_{j,b}^R(w_j, \mathbf{U}) = \mathrm{Re}\{w_j \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{U} \mathbf{s}_b\}, \quad 1 \leq b \leq N_b.$$

Therefore, the probability of error can be calculated as

$$P_{e_j} = \int_{-\infty}^{0} p(y_j^R | s_j = +1) dy_j^R = \frac{1}{N_{pb}} \sum_{\substack{b=1 \\ s_j \neq -1}}^{N_{pb}} Q\left(\frac{\bar{y}_{j,b}^R}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_z^2 |w_j|^2}{2}}} \right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{s_{b,j} \mathrm{Re}\{ w_j \mathbf{h}_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l} \}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}} |w_j|} \right), \quad (1)$$

where $s_{b,j}$ is the jth symbol of $\mathbf{s}_b$ and $Q(x)$ is defined as $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}} du$.

IV. Minimum Probability of Error Precoding

In this section, our objective is to minimize the weighted sum of error probabilities for two different scenarios:

1) First scenario- the receiver only needs its own channel information to calculate its filter coefficient and there is no need for extra feedback. It is assumed that the receivers use ML detection. We try to minimize the weighted sum of error probabilities only over transmit precoding weights since each receive filter coefficient could be expressed as a function of transmit precoding weights. This method, while yielding suboptimal performance as compared to joint transmit precoding-receive filtering is nevertheless easier to practically realize.
2) Second scenario- we assume joint transmit precoding-receive filtering in which we minimize the error sum over both transmit precoding and receive filtering weights. This approach could be considered as the optimal method for communications in broadcast system when considering the error probability as the measure of quality.

If one wants to minimize error probabilities of all users, it means that several objective functions have to be minimized which are all interdependent by the common transmit precoding matrix. A standard approach to this multiple-objective optimization problem is to combine the individual objective functions into a single composite function [24], [25]. Similar to [8], we use the weighted average error probability of users $P_e = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{K} \alpha_j} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \alpha_j P_{e_j}$. If $\alpha_j = 1$ for all users, i.e., all users have the same priority, the weighted average turns to a simple average of the error probability

of users in (1) as

$$P_e = \frac{1}{K}\sum_{j=1}^{K} P_{e_j} \\ = \frac{1}{KN_b}\sum_{j=1}^{K}\sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j \mathbf{h}_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}|w_j|}\right), \tag{2}$$

which is considerd as the system performance criterion hereafter. The parameters $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, \ldots, w_K]$ and $\mathbf{U}$ have a bilinear dependence in the numerator of each Q-function argument of (2). Now, we state the following constraints that are required in both forthcoming scenarios.

Proposition 1: For the jth user not to have an error floor (a rough lower bound on error probability), it is necessary for w_j to comply with the following constraints:

$$s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\left\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\right\} \geq 0, \qquad 1 \leq b \leq N_b. \tag{3}$$

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

A. Transmit Precoding with ML Receiver

For the first scenario, it is assumed that the receivers use single-user maximum likelihood detection similar to [6]. Additionally, for the transmit precoding design the receive filtering weights are assumed to be available at the transmitter, because they could be calculated in closed-form at the transmitter. For ML detection the receive filter coefficient of a user can be expressed as a function of its transmit precoding vector and channel as [6]

$$w_j = \frac{\mathbf{u}_j^H \mathbf{h}_j^H}{|\mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_j|^2}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq K.$$

Consequently, the error probability of a user in (1) will be only a function of $\mathbf{U}$ and so will be the average error probability of users in (2):

$$P_e^{\mathrm{ML}}(\mathbf{U}) = \frac{1}{KN_b}\sum_{j=1}^{K}\sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathrm{Re}\{\mathbf{u}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{H}} \mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{H}} \mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{j}} \mathbf{u}_{\mathrm{l}} s_{\mathrm{b,l}} s_{\mathrm{b,j}}\}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}|\mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_j|}\right). \tag{4}$$

Now, we try to minimize the average error probability $P_e^{\mathrm{ML}}(\mathbf{U})$ by constraining the total transmit power. Based on Proposition 1, the arguments of Q-functions are constrained to be nonnegative.

Thus, the transmit precoding optimization problem is stated as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{\mathbf{U}} P_e^{\text{ML}} \\
&\text{subject to} \quad \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^H) \leq \tau, \\
&\sum_{l=1}^{K} \text{Re}\{\mathbf{u}_j^H \mathbf{h}_j^H \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l} s_{b,j}\} \geq 0, \ 1 \leq j \leq K, \ 1 \leq b \leq N_b,
\end{aligned}$$

where τ is the total transmit power constraint.

Now, let us restate the transmit precoding vector $\mathbf{u}_j$ of each user as

$$\mathbf{u}_j = a_j \bar{\mathbf{u}}_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq K,$$

where $a_j = \|\mathbf{u}_j\|_2$ is the amplitude of $\mathbf{u}_j$ and $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_j = \frac{\mathbf{u}_j}{\|\mathbf{u}_j\|_2}$, i.e., $\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}_j\|_2 = 1$. By using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality the following upper bound on the error probability (4) is obtained:

$$P_e^{\text{ML-Up}} = \frac{1}{KN_b} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{K} \text{Re}\{\bar{\mathbf{u}}_j^H \mathbf{h}_j^H \mathbf{h}_j \bar{\mathbf{u}}_l s_{b,l} s_{b,j} a_l\}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}} \|\mathbf{h}_j\|}\right). \tag{5}$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and therefore the upper bound is tight if $\mathbf{u}_j = \mathbf{h}_j^H$, which can occur when all channels are orthogonal to each other. Now, we minimize (5) as follows:

$$\min_{\bar{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{a}} P_e^{\text{ML-Up}} \tag{6a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{K} a_j^2 \leq \tau, \tag{6b}$$

$$|\mathbf{h}_j \bar{\mathbf{u}}_j|^2 a_j + \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq j}}^{K} \text{Re}\{\bar{\mathbf{u}}_j^H \mathbf{h}_j^H \mathbf{h}_j \bar{\mathbf{u}}_l s_{b,l} s_{b,j} a_l\} \geq 0, \quad \begin{matrix} 1 \leq j \leq K, \\ 1 \leq b \leq N_b, \end{matrix} \tag{6c}$$

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}_j\| = 1, \quad 1 \leq j \leq K, \tag{6d}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{U}} = [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1, \cdots, \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K]$ and $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, \cdots, a_K]$.

We propose the alternating minimization algorithm of Table I which minimizes $P_e^{\text{ML-U}}$ over $\bar{\mathbf{U}}$ and $\mathbf{a}$ alternatingly to solve (6). The algorithm iterates until the average error probability converges with the accuracy of $P_e^{\text{threshold}}$. In Minimization 1 of the proposed algorithm, when (6a) is minimized over $\bar{\mathbf{U}}$, constraint (6b) does not depend on the minimization parameter and can be removed. Similarly, in Minimization 2, when (6a) is minimized over $\mathbf{a}$, constraints in (6d)

TABLE I

ALTERNATING MINIMIZATION ALGORITHM FOR SOLVING (6)

Initialization:

$\bar{\mathbf{U}}^{\mathbf{0}} \leftarrow$ random complex $M \times K$ matrix such that each column is normalized.

$\mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{0}} \leftarrow$ random real positive $1 \times K$ vector such that $\sum_{j=1}^{K} (a_j^0)^2 \leq \tau$.

Initialize P_e^1 and $P_e^2 < P_e^1$ with proper values to start the while loop, e.g. $P_e^1 = 1$ and $P_e^2 = 0.5$.

while $P_e^1 - P_e^2 > P_e^{\text{threshold}}$ **do**

$P_e^1 \leftarrow P_e^2$.

Minimization 1:

Minimize (6) over $\bar{\mathbf{U}}$ assuming that $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{0}}$, and using the initial value of $\bar{\mathbf{U}}^{\mathbf{0}}$ for $\bar{\mathbf{U}}$.

$\bar{\mathbf{U}}^{\mathbf{0}} \leftarrow \bar{\mathbf{U}}^{\text{opt}}$.

Minimization 2:

Minimize (6) over $\mathbf{a}$ assuming $\bar{\mathbf{U}} = \bar{\mathbf{U}}^{\mathbf{0}}$, by using a numerical convex optimization method and the initial value of $\mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{0}}$ for $\mathbf{a}$.

$\mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{0}} \leftarrow \mathbf{a}^{\text{opt}}$.

$P_e^2 \leftarrow P_e^{\text{ML-U}}(\bar{\mathbf{U}}^{\mathbf{0}}, \mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{0}})$.

end while

$\mathbf{U} = \bar{\mathbf{U}}^{\mathbf{0}} \text{diag}(\mathbf{a})$ is the transmit precoding matrix.

are not included since they are independent of the optimization parameters. Now, we observe that the alternating minimization algorithm has the following properties:

Property 1: Minimization 2 in Table I is a convex optimization problem.

Proof: See Appendix B ■

Theorem 1: The algorithm presented in Table I converges to a local minimum of (6).

Proof: The objective function $P_e^{\text{ML-U}}(\bar{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{a})$ is minimized in Minimization 1 of Table I over $\bar{\mathbf{U}}$ while keeping $\mathbf{a}$ fixed at the values obtained in Minimization 2 of the previous iteration. Therefore, at each iteration of the algorithm the value of the objective function after Minimization 1 is non-increasing compared to the value of the objective function after Minimization 2 of the previous iteration. In Minimization 2 of Table I, $P_e^{\text{ML-U}}(\bar{\mathbf{U}}, \mathbf{a})$ is minimized over $\mathbf{a}$ while keeping $\bar{\mathbf{U}}$ at the values obtained in Minimization 1. Therefore, the value of $P_e^{\text{ML-U}}$ does not increase

compared to the result of Minimization 1 of the same iteration. Therefore, each iteration of the algorithm causes $P_e^{\text{ML-U}}$ to be non-increasing. Moreover, considering the fact that $P_e^{\text{ML-U}}$ is always nonnegative, $0 \leq P_e^{\text{ML-U}} \leq 1$, guarantees that the algorithm converges to a stationary (minimum) point. ■

B. Joint Transmit Precoding-Receive Filtering

For the second scenario, it is assumed that the receive filter coefficients are calculated by the transmitter in conjunction with the transmit precoding weights, and each receiver is provided with its receive filter coefficient. In this scenario, the transmitter finds the transmit precoding weights and receive filter coefficients that minimize the average error probability of users. Therefore, the joint MPE transmit precoding-receive filtering problem is represented by

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\mathbf{w},\mathbf{U}} P_e \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^H) \leq \tau, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where P_e is the average error probability of (2). It should be noted that the error probability of user j, P_{e_j} in (1), depends on its receive filter coefficient w_j, and the transmit precoding matrix of all users $\mathbf{U}$, but it does not directly depend on the receive filter coefficients of other users[1]. Based on this observation we strive to develop an alternating minimization algorithm to solve (7). Before developing the optimization algorithm, we determine key properties of (1), (2), and (7) that will be utilized.

Property 2: The error probability in (1) and therefore the average error probability (2) are invariant to the scaling of w_j by a positive constant.

Proof is obvious and therefore omitted. Based on this property, one can set $|w_j| = 1$ in the error probability of (1) and (2) and add $|w_j| = 1,\ 1 \leq j \leq K$, as additional constraints to (7).

Property 3: For a fixed $\mathbf{U}$ that satisfies $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^{\text{H}}) \leq \tau$, we have $\underset{\mathbf{w}}{\text{argmin}} P_e = [\underset{w_1}{\text{argmin}} P_{e_1}, \ldots, \underset{w_K}{\text{argmin}} P_{e_K}]$. In other words, $\underset{w_j}{\text{argmin}}\, P_e = \underset{w_j}{\text{argmin}}\, P_{e_j}$.

This is obvious since each P_{e_j} depends only on w_j but not on $w_l,\ l \neq j$. Therefore, minimizing (2) over all w_js could be partitioned into K decoupled minimizations of P_{e_j} over w_js, for $1 \leq j \leq K$.

[1]Although explicitly P_{e_j} does not depend on $w_{k \neq j}$, it indirectly is coupled with them, because $\mathbf{U}$ depends on all receive filters.

If one wants to solve (7) over $\mathbf{w}$ for a given $\mathbf{U}$, it is clear from Properties 2 and 3 and Proposition 1 that when there exists no error floor, without loss of generality, the constraints $|w_j| = 1$ and (3), for $1 \leq j \leq K$, could be added to the optimization problem. Therefore, for a given $\mathbf{U}$, the K optimization problems arising from (7) could be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{w_j} \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z} s_{b,j} \mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\right) \\ &\text{subject to} \quad |w_j| = 1, \\ &\qquad\qquad s_{b,j} \mathrm{Re}\left\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\right\} \geq 0, \qquad 1 \leq b \leq N_b, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq K$. Now, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 2: If the constraints in the minimization problem (8) are satisfied, any local minimizer of error probability function P_{e_j}, i.e., the objective function of the optimization problem (8), is also a global minimizer. Moreover, the global minimizer is unique.

Proof: See Appendix C. ■

Property 4: $\min_{w_j} P_{e_j}$, where P_{e_j} is calculated as in (1), could be transformed to a convex optimization problem with a unique global minimizer.

Proof: See Appendix D. ■

Hence, based on Properties 2-4, (7) is written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{w},\mathbf{U}} \frac{1}{KN_b} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z} s_{b,j} \mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\right) \tag{9a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^H) \leq \tau, \tag{9b}$$

$$|w_j| \leq 1, \qquad 1 \leq j \leq K, \tag{9c}$$

$$s_{b,j} \mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\} \geq 0, \ 1 \leq j \leq K, \ 1 \leq b \leq N_b. \tag{9d}$$

Property 5: Optimization problem (9) is a convex optimization problem with respect to $\mathbf{U}$.

Proof: See Appendix E. ■

Using Properties 4 and 5, we propose the alternating minimization algorithm of Table II for problem (7). It should be noted that in Minimization 1 of Table II, when (9a) is minimized over $\mathbf{U}$, constraints in (9c) do not depend on the optimization parameter and are therefore not included. It is easily shown that the algorithm in Table II converges to a local minimum.

TABLE II

ALTERNATING MINIMIZATION ALGORITHM FOR SOLVING (7)

Initialization:

$\mathbf{U_0} \leftarrow$ random complex $M \times K$ matrix.

$\mathbf{U_0} \leftarrow \frac{\mathbf{U_0}}{\|\mathbf{U_0}\|_F}\sqrt{\tau}$.

$w_0 \leftarrow$ normalized random complex number.

$\mathbf{w_0} \leftarrow [w_0]_{1\times K}$.

Initialize $\mathbf{P_e^1} = [P_{e_1}^1, \cdots, P_{e_K}^1]$ and $\mathbf{P_e^2} \prec \mathbf{P_e^1}$ with proper values to start the while loop, e.g. $\mathbf{P_e^1} = [1]_{1\times K}$ and $\mathbf{P_e^2} = [0.5]_{1\times K}$.

while $\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{K} P_{e_j}^1 - P_{e_j}^2}{K} > P_e^{\text{threshold}}$ **do**

$\mathbf{P_e^1} \leftarrow \mathbf{P_e^2}$.

Minimization 1:

Minimize (9) over $\mathbf{U}$ assuming that $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w_0}$ by using a numerical convex optimization method and the initial value of $\mathbf{U_0}$ for $\mathbf{U}$.

$\mathbf{U_0} \leftarrow \mathbf{U}^{\text{opt}}$.

Minimization 2:

for $j = 1 : K$ **do**

Minimize (25) over w_j assuming $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U_0}$ by using a numerical convex optimization method and the initial value of w_{0j} for w_j .

$w_{0j} \leftarrow w_j^{\text{opt}}$.

$P_{e_j}^2 \leftarrow P_{e_j}(\mathbf{U_0}, w_{0j})$.

end for

end while

$\mathbf{U_0}$ and $\mathbf{w_0}$ are the transmit precoding weights and receive filter coefficients, respectively.

Theorem 2: The algorithm in Table II converges to a local minimum of (7).

Proof: Since the objective function $P_e(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{w})$ is minimized at both Minimization 1 and 2, each iteration causes P_e to be non-increasing. Moreover, considering the fact that P_e is always nonnegative, $0 \leq P_e \leq 1$, it guarantees that the algorithm converges to a stationary (minimum) point. ■

V. User Selection

In this section, we develop a user selection algorithm by taking into account that MPE transmit precoding is utilized at the transmitter. It is assumed that in total K_T users are in the system such that $K_T \gg M$ and the set of all users is given by $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \cdots, K_T\}$. For a given time period, the transmitter selects a subset, $\mathcal{S}$, of K users out of K_T users, $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, for transmission. The users should be selected in such a way that certain criteria are met. We are interested in maximizing the number of selected users and minimizing the error probabilities at the same time. Since all users receive BPSK signals, maximizing the number of users may also increase the throughput. Hence, ideally we would like to solve the following multiobjective optimization problem which, compared to (9), only has an extra objective function:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{\mathbf{w},\mathbf{U},\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{KN_b}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{A}}\sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z}s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j\sum_{l\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\right)\\
&\max_{\mathbf{w},\mathbf{U},\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{A}} K\\
&\text{subject to}\quad \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^H)\le\tau,\\
&|w_j|\le 1, \qquad\qquad j\in\mathcal{S},\\
&s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j\sum_{l\in\mathcal{S}}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\ge 0,\ j\in\mathcal{S},\ 1\le b\le N_b,
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $K = |\mathcal{S}|$ is the cardinality of the set of selected users. In the majority of existing user selection algorithms, e.g. [4], [18], the number of selected users K should be less than or equal to the degrees of freedom (DoF) of the system, which in this case is equal to the number of transmit antennas M. However, in our proposed user selection algorithm, the number of selected users could be more than the DoF of the system, as will be confirmed in the numerical results. The increase in the number of selected users is made possible because in the proposed user selection algorithm the constraints of the optimization (10) originate from the MPE precoding problem which in turn exploits a one-dimensional discrete modulation rather than a continuous Gaussian input distribution.

Practically, it is more suitable to solve the user selection and precoding problems separately. Although suboptimal, (10) is separated into a minimization over $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{w}$ and a maximization over $\mathcal{S}$. Since the precoding problem has been addressed in Section IV, user selection will be

the only focus in this section. Therefore, instead of (10) we solve

$$\max_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{A}} |\mathcal{S}| \tag{11a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^H) = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}} \|\mathbf{u}_j\|^2 \leq \tau, \tag{11b}$$

$$|w_j| \leq 1, \qquad j \in \mathcal{S}, \tag{11c}$$

$$s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\} \geq 0, \ j \in \mathcal{S}, \ 1 \leq b \leq N_b. \tag{11d}$$

In other words, (11) maximizes the cardinality of the set of selected users such that none of the selected users experience error floors and the transmit power constraint is met, i.e., the number of selected users is maximized subject to the constraint set of the MPE precoding problem. This means that we try to find the maximum number of users such that the feasible region of the MPE precoding problem is not an empty set. This combinatorial optimization problem has very high computational complexity. Therefore, we try to find a suboptimal algorithm for finding a *good* set of selected users.

For a tractable solution, we are interested in user selection as a separate entity from precoding. Therefore, we try to remove the dependence of the optimization problem (11) from the transmit precoding and receive filtering weights. But before doing this, we first simplify the problem by finding a lower bound for the left side of the inequality of the constraint (11d) as

$$s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j\sum_{l\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\} \geq \mathrm{Re}\{w_j\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_j\} - \sum_{\substack{l\in\mathcal{S}\\ l\neq j}} |\mathrm{Re}\{w_j\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l\}|.$$

This lower bound is obtained by using the fact $s_{b,j}s_{bl} = \pm 1$ and $x \geq -|x|$. Since this lower bound is independent of b, all N_b constraints for a fixed j in (11d) are replaced with the single constraint:

$$\mathrm{Re}\{w_j\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_j\} - \sum_{\substack{l\in\mathcal{S}\\ l\neq j}} |\mathrm{Re}\{w_j\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l\}| \geq 0, \ j \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{12}$$

Replacing (11d) with (12) reduces the number of constraints in the optimization problem (11). Now, if we further assume that the receivers use ML detection with normalized filter coefficients we have $w_j = \frac{\mathbf{u}_j^H\mathbf{h}_j^H}{|\mathbf{u}_j^H\mathbf{h}_j^H|}$ and therefore (11c) could be removed from (11). The modified constraint of (11d), i.e., (12) is then substituted by the following bound:

$$\sum_{\substack{l\in\mathcal{S}\\ l\neq j}} |\mathrm{Re}\{\mathbf{u}_j^H\mathbf{h}_j^H\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l\}| \leq |\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_j|^2.$$

Now, to remove the dependence of the user selection problem on transmit precoding vectors $\mathbf{u}_j$s, normalized maximum ratio transmission (conjugate beamforming) is assumed for transmission such that $\mathbf{u}_j = \mathbf{h}_j^H \sqrt{\frac{P_T}{\sum_{l\in\mathcal{S}} |\mathbf{h}_l|^2}}$ [26], [27]. Consequently, this removes (11b) and simplifies (11d) further to

$$\sum_{\substack{l\in\mathcal{S}\\ l\neq j}} |\mathrm{Re}\{\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H\}| \leq \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2.$$

Therefore, the user selection optimization problem has been simplified to

$$\max_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{A}} |\mathcal{S}| \tag{13a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{\substack{l\in\mathcal{S}\\ l\neq j}} |\mathrm{Re}\{\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H\}| \leq \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2, \ \forall j \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{13b}$$

This problem could be interpreted as follows: There is an M dimensional vector space on the complex field $\mathbb{C}$, i.e., $\mathbb{C}^M$, in which there are $K_T \gg M$ given elements. We want to choose the maximum number of elements with the following properties: $\sum_{\substack{l\in\mathcal{S}\\ l\neq j}} |\mathrm{Re}\{\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H\}| \leq \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2, \ \forall j \in \mathcal{S}$.

Now, we try to simplify the problem by reducing the feasible region. A sufficient condition for (13b) to hold is that

$$|\mathrm{Re}\{\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H\}| \leq \frac{\min(\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2, \|\mathbf{h}_l\|^2)}{|\mathcal{S}|-1}, \ \forall j,l \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Substituting (13b) with the above sufficient condition gives us

$$\max_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{A}} |\mathcal{S}|$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \frac{|\mathrm{Re}\{\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H\}|}{\min(\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2, \|\mathbf{h}_l\|^2)} \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|-1}, \ \forall j,l \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{14}$$

From a geometric point of view, problem (14) is similar to packing lines in a Grassmannian manifold of dimension M, i.e., $G(1,M)$ [28]–[31]. Namely, problem (14) is to pack the M-complex space with the maximum number of lines passing through the origin such that *real correlation distance* between any two lines is less than some value, where we define the real correlation distance between two lines as

$$d_{\mathrm{RC}}(\mathbf{h}_j, \mathbf{h}_l) \triangleq \frac{|\mathrm{Re}\{\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H\}|}{\min(\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2, \|\mathbf{h}_l\|^2)}.$$

TABLE III

GEOMETRIC USER SELECTION ALGORITHM

Initialization:

$iter = 0$.

$K^{iter+1} = M + 1$.

loop

$iter \leftarrow iter + 1$.

$i = 1$.

$\mathcal{S}^{iter} = \emptyset$.

$\mathcal{A}_i^{iter} = \{1, \cdots, K_T\}$.

$\mathcal{C}_i^{iter} = \mathcal{A}_i^{iter}$.

Main Body of Algorithm:

while $i \leq K^{iter}$ and $\mathcal{C}_i \neq \emptyset$ **do**

$\pi_i^{iter} = \underset{j \in \mathcal{C}_i^{iter}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2$.

$\mathcal{S}^{iter} = \mathcal{S}^{iter} \cup \{\pi_i^{iter}\}$.

$\mathcal{A}_i^{iter} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_i^{iter} \setminus \{\pi_i^{iter}\}$.

$\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{iter} = \mathcal{A}_i^{iter} \setminus \{\forall j \in \mathcal{A}_i^{iter} | d_{\text{RC}}(\mathbf{h}_j, \mathbf{h}_{\pi_i^{iter}}) > \frac{1}{K^{iter}-1}\}$.

$\mathcal{C}_{i+1}^{iter} = \{\forall j \in \mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{iter} | d_{\text{RC}}(\mathbf{h}_j, \mathbf{h}_{\pi_i^{iter}}) > \frac{\alpha}{K^{iter}-1}\}$.

if $\mathcal{C}_{i+1}^{iter} = \emptyset$ **then**

$\mathcal{C}_{i+1}^{iter} = \mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{iter}$.

end if

$i \leftarrow i + 1$.

end while

Decision for Next Iteration

end loop

It should be remarked that d_{RC} is not actually a distance or metric but only possess some properties of a metric. To solve (14) we propose the geometric user selection (GUS) algorithm of Table III.

This suboptimum low-complexity algorithm semi-greedily[2] selects users based on both their channel strength and their real correlation distance. In the Main Body of Algorithm in Table III,

[2]The algorithm is semi-greedy rather than greedy since it does not select the best channel at each iteration. Nonetheless, it first removes some of the users which are not orthogonal to the last selected users and then selects the best user among the remaining ones.

first the user with the strongest channel in the set of candidate users, $\mathcal{C}$, is opted for the set of selected users $\mathcal{S}$. Then, any user from the set of available users, $\mathcal{A}$, with real correlation distance of more than $\frac{1}{K-1}$ from the previously selected user, π_i, is removed for the next set of available users. To make the packing tighter, the algorithm selects users from a set of candidate users rather than from all available users. A user is considered for the next set of candidate users if its distance from the last selected user, π_i, is close to the upper bound $\frac{1}{K-1}$. The parameter α determines how close the distance of the next candidate users from the last selected user should be to the upper bound. The Main Body of Algorithm iterates until either K users are selected or the set of candidate users is empty. It should be remarked that the cardinality of the selected set in this algorithm is upper bounded by the initial guess for the number of users K.

In Decision for Next Iteration in Table III, it is decided whether the set of selected users could be improved either in the sense of size or the distance among users. If $iter = 1$, then depending on whether the cardinality of the selected set is equal to K^{iter} or less than K^{iter}, K is incremented or decremented respectively, i.e., $K^{iter+1} = K^{iter} + 1$ or $K^{iter+1} = K^{iter} - 1$. As a result the number of iterations is always greater than one. If $iter \neq 1$ then one of four different scenarios may occur:

1) If $K^{iter} > K^{iter-1}$ and the size of the current selected set is larger than or equal to the size of the previous selected set ($|\mathcal{S}^{iter}| \geq |\mathcal{S}^{iter-1}|$), then the algorithm gets greedy and prepares to check if the size of the selected set could be further improved by incrementing K for the next iteration, i.e., $K^{iter+1} = K^{iter} + 1$.
2) If $K^{iter} > K^{iter-1}$ and $|\mathcal{S}^{iter}| < |\mathcal{S}^{iter-1}|$ then the previous selected set is considered as the selected set ($\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{iter-1}$) and the algorithm breaks from the loop.
3) If $K^{iter} < K^{iter-1}$ and $|\mathcal{S}^{iter}| \geq K^{iter} - 1$ then the current selected set is chosen as the selected set ($\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{iter}$) and the algorithm breaks from the loop.
4) Otherwise, $K^{iter+1} = K^{iter} - 1$.

Rmark: Now, we justify the choice of $K = M+1$ as the initial value for K in GUS algorithm. In the context of packing, geodesic distance and chordal distance are common metrics with existing bounds for packing problems. Therefore, to find an approximate value for the maximum number of users K, the size of the feasible region in (14) is reduced, again by replacing the

constraint of (14) with a sufficient condition as

$$\max_{\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{A}} |\mathcal{S}| \tag{15a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \qquad \frac{|\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H|}{\min\left(\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2, \|\mathbf{h}_l\|^2\right)} \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|-1},\ \forall j,l \in \mathcal{S}, \tag{15b}$$

allowing us to utilize existing bounds from differential geometry.

Next, we find an approximation for the maximum number of lines that could fill the M space such that (15b) is satisfied. In $G(1,M)$, the principal angle between lines $\mathbf{h}_j$ and $\mathbf{h}_l$ is defined as [32]

$$\theta_{j,l} = \arccos \frac{|\langle \mathbf{h}_j, \mathbf{h}_l \rangle|}{\|\mathbf{h}_j\|\|\mathbf{h}_l\|}$$

and the chordal distance between two lines is defined as [28], [29]

$$d_c(\mathbf{h}_j, \mathbf{h}_l) = |\sin(\theta_{j,l})| = \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H|^2}{\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2\|\mathbf{h}_l\|^2}}. \tag{16}$$

Similar to the Rankin bound for spherical codes, there exists the following upper bound on the chordal distance between any two lines in the Grassmannian manifolds for packing K lines [28], [29]:

$$d_c^2 \leq \begin{cases} \frac{(M-1)K}{M(K-1)} & \text{if } K \leq \binom{M+1}{2} \\ \frac{(M-1)}{M} & \text{if } K > \binom{M+1}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Using (16) and (17) we have

$$\begin{cases} \frac{|\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H|^2}{\min\left(\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^4, \|\mathbf{h}_l\|^4\right)} \geq \frac{|\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H|^2}{\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2\|\mathbf{h}_l\|^2} \geq 1 - \frac{(M-1)K}{M(K-1)} & \text{if } K \leq \binom{M+1}{2} \\ \frac{|\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H|^2}{\min\left(\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^4, \|\mathbf{h}_l\|^4\right)} \geq \frac{|\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_l^H|^2}{\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2\|\mathbf{h}_l\|^2} \geq 1 - \frac{(M-1)}{M} & \text{if } K > \binom{M+1}{2} \end{cases}$$

and by taking (15b) into account, we have

$$\begin{cases} 1 - \frac{(M-1)K}{M(K-1)} \leq \frac{1}{(K-1)^2} & \text{if } K \leq \binom{M+1}{2} \\ 1 - \frac{(M-1)}{M} \leq \frac{1}{(K-1)^2} & \text{if } K > \binom{M+1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

This is equivalent to the following sufficient (but not necessary) condition:

$$K \leq M + 1,$$

which serves as an approximation to the number of selected users for the first iteration in the GUS algorithm.

A. Complexity Analysis

Similar to [19], we analyze the computational complexity of the proposed GUS algorithm, using flop counts by assuming that a real addition, multiplication, division, or comparison is counted as one flop. The computational complexity of the GUS algorithm is calculated as follows:

- It takes $2M$ real multiplications and $2M-1$ real addition to calculate $\|\mathbf{h}_j\|^2$. Therefore, $K_T(4M-1)$ flops are needed, to calculate all channel norms. Calculation of the channel norms is only performed once at the beginning of the GUS algorithm.
- Inside the while loop, it takes $|\mathcal{C}_i^{iter}|$ comparisons to find π_i^{iter}.
- To calculate $d_{\text{RC}}(\mathbf{h}_j, \mathbf{h}_{\pi_i^{iter}})$, $4M+2$ flops are required, since channel norms are already calculated. Therefore, to construct $\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{iter}$, $(4M+3)|\mathcal{A}_i^{iter}|$ flops are required.
- Since the real correlation distances are already calculated, it takes $|\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{iter}|$ flops for comparisons to construct $\mathcal{C}_{i+1}^{iter+1}$.
- The total number of flops in each while loop is therefore counted as $|\mathcal{C}_i^{iter}| + |\mathcal{A}_i^{iter}|(4M+3)+|\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{iter}|$. At each iteration of the while loop, it is obvious that $|\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^{iter}| \leq |\mathcal{A}_i^{iter}|$. Moreover, $|\mathcal{A}_i^{iter}| \leq K_T$ and $|\mathcal{C}_i^{iter}| \leq K_T$. Therefore, $K_T(4M+5)$ is an upper bound on the number of flops in each while loop.
- The maximum number of iterations in the while loop is K^{iter} which is upper bounded by $2M$. The maximum number of outer loop iteration is M. Hence, the $2M^2(4M+5)K_T + (4M-1)K_T$ is an upper bound on the total number of flops ψ, which indicates that $\psi \approx O(K_T M^3)$.

Therefore, the complexity order is the same as that of SUS algorithm [4], [18].

VI. Numerical Results

A. MPE Precoding Methods

In this section, we first consider a broadcast channel with a 3-antenna transmitter sending information to 3 users each equipped with 1 antenna. It is assume that the transmitter has one information symbol for each receiver in the same time and frequency slots. The channel gains are assumed to be quasi static and follow a Rayleigh distribution. Since our focus is on various precoding methods rather than on the effects of channel estimation, we assume that perfect CSI of all channels is available at the transmitter and each receiver only has perfect knowledge of its own channels [3], [6]. At the receivers, white Gaussian noise is added to the received signal.

Fig. 2 compares the bit error rates of MSLNR, ZF, MMSE, MPE-ML (from Section IV-A), and MPE joint transmit precoding-receive filtering (Tx-Rx) (from Section IV-B) methods. For all of these methods, maximum likelihood is used at the receiver except for MPE joint Tx-Rx in which each receive filter coefficient is calculated by the transmitter jointly with the transmit precoding weights and is provided to the corresponding receiver. As can be seen, MPE transmit precoding methods substantially improve the performance of all users. For example, at BER of 10^{-2} both MPE precoding methods show a gain of about 6.5dB compared with MMSE precoding and much more gain compared with ZF and MSLNR. It should be mentioned that in Fig. 2, theoretical BER curves of MPE-ML and MPE Tx-Rx methods are obtained by substituting the calculated precoding weights for each channel realization into the error probability expressions of (5) and (9a), respectively. All other curves in Fig. 2 are the result of Monte Carlo simulations. As can be seen in Fig. 2 the simulations confirm the theoretical results. It is interesting to observe that the performance of MPE-ML precoding closely follows that of the MPE joint Tx-Rx up to a certain SNR. At higher SNRs, although still outperforming classical precoding methods, MPE-ML precoding shows a large gap in performance compared with MPE Tx-Rx. The reason that MPE-ML precoding cannot follow the performance of MPE Tx-Rx is that in Minimization 1 of Table I the optimization problem is not convex. Therefore, the solver of the optimization might get stuck at a local minimizer instead of the global minimizer of (6).

In Fig. 3 we show the average number of iterations needed for the convergence of the algorithms in Tables I and II. In both algorithms the average number of iterations is less than 20. It is very interesting to observe that as SNR increases the number of iterations needed for the convergence of the algorithm in Table II decreases. This is because $P_e^{\text{threshold}}$ is set fixed at 10^{-8} for all SNRs while the error probability decreases from about 10^{-1} to 10^{-5}. If it is assumed that the error probability is known in advance, it would be better to change $P_e^{\text{threshold}}$ to a small fraction of the error probability to have a faster convergence with the same reliability.

B. User Selection

First, the proposed GUS algorithm is compared with semi-orthogonal user selection (SUS) algorithm of [4]. Fig. 4 shows the average number of selected users over 1,000 different channel realizations versus the total number of available users for three different cases: when the number of transmit antennas is 2, 4, and 6. We observe that for SUS it is possible to have at most as



Fig. 2. Bit error rate of users using MSLNR, ZF, MMSE, MPE-ML, and MPE joint transmit precoding-receive filtering (Tx-Rx) for $M = 3$ antenna transmitter and $K = 3$ users with BPSK modulation and without user selection.



Fig. 3. Average number of iterations for convergence of algorithms of Table I and II when $M = 3$ antennas and $K = 3$ users without user selection.

many users as the number of transmit antennas, as it is obvious by its algorithm in [4], while GUS may select more users. For example, when there are $K_T = 10,000$ users available[3], GUS

[3]Of course it is not practical to service 10,000 users with one transmitter. This large number of users is just for illustration purposes to gain insight into the system.



Fig. 4. Average number of selected users vs. total number of available users for $M = 2, 4, 6$ antennas.

can select 6 users with only 4 antennas compared to the 4 selected users of the SUS algorithm. When the transmitter has 2 antennas and there are only 10 users available to select from, GUS can select 2.48 users on average which is still more than the number of transmit antennas, while SUS selects 1.92 users on average. It should be remarked that in all our simulations the parameter α in GUS is set to be $\frac{K^{iter}-1}{K^{iter}}$.

As expected, it can also be seen that until saturation, the number of selected users for both GUS and SUS increases as the total number of available users increases. Each user corresponds to a line passing through the origin of the complex M dimensional hypersphere. Hence, when the number of users increases, the density of possible lines to choose from increases. This makes it more likely to pack the space with more lines obeying the specific distance. It should be remarked that when $M = 6$, for smaller numbers of users SUS outperforms GUS. This indicates the requirement for the development of better algorithms than GUS, which would not only be able to select more users than the number of transmit antennas as GUS does, but would also be capable of outperforming SUS in all scenarios.

Now, we study the effect of user selection in conjunction with precoding. Consider a system with a 2-antenna transmitter that first selects a set of users out of $K_T = 50$ users by using either GUS or SUS, and then sends information to the selected users using various precoding methods. Fig. 5 shows the error probabilities of different combinations of user selection and precoding



Fig. 5. Average bit error rate of users when $M = 2$ antennas and $K_T = 50$ users. In this scenario, the average number of selected users over all SNRs is 2 for SUS while it is 3.19 for GUS.

methods. As can be seen, the lowest error probabilities are achieved by SUS rather than GUS, and by a small margin, MPE precoding outperforms all other precoding methods used for SUS. However, it could not be simply concluded that the SUS algorithm outperforms GUS since the average number of selected users over all SNRs is 2 for SUS while it is 3.19 for GUS. In other words, although GUS selects more users, the users have higher error probabilities in comparison with the selected users of SUS, as expected. It should be noticed that for the proposed geometric user selection algorithm, ZF and MMSE precoding performance curves are absent from Fig. 5, since the number of selected users by GUS is larger than the number of transmit antennas and is therefore not suitable for ZF and MMSE precoding.

As observed in Fig. 5, since the error probability alone is not a good indicator of the performance when there are different numbers of users in the system, Fig. 6 is provided to give more insight into the performances of GUS and SUS. In Fig. 6 the throughput is shown for different combinations of user selection and precoding. Similar to [15], we use the notion of expected throughput for frame-based transmission as $E[\mathrm{Thr}] = (1 - P_e)^{\ell} K_{\mathrm{avg}}$ bits per channel use, where ℓ is the frame size and K_{avg} is the average number of selected users. We consider two different frame sizes: 100 and 500 bits. No channel coding is assumed, and a transmission is considered to be successful if the entire frame is decoded error-free. It can be seen in Fig.



Fig. 6. Average frame-wise rate when $M = 2$, $K_T = 50$, and frame sizes of 100 and 500 bits.

6 that as SNR increases the achievable expected throughput approaches limits determined by the average numbers of selected users by SUS and GUS. For this example, at higher SNRs the achievable throughput by GUS and MPE precoding is about 160% of the achievable throughput by SUS and any of the other precoding methods. Moreover, Fig. 5 shows that as the frame size increases the throughput decreases. However, for all frame sizes the throughput eventually approaches its upper limit, which is dictated by the average number of selected users.

VII. Conclusions

In this paper, it has been demonstrated that by exploiting the modulation type, a transmit precoder can be designed with significantly improved performance. For BPSK, this amount to minimizing the average error probability of multiple users. Two algorithms were developed based on the concepts of alternating minimization and convex optimization for two different cases: (i) when the receivers use single-user maximum likelihood detection, (ii) when the transmitter optimizes the transmit precoding weights and the receive filter coefficients jointly. For BPSK signalling, it has been shown that minimum probability of error precoding outperforms conventional transmit precoding methods such as ZF, MMSE, and MSLNR. Unfortunately, the results reported here for BPSK do not easily generalize to enable the combining of transmit precoding with other types of modulation and instead represents a topic of ongoing and future

research. A very significant finding reported here is the proposed geometric user selection (GUS) algorithm has been shown to be able to select more users than the number of transmit antennas as well as increase total throughput.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

Assume that there exists a $b = b_1$ such that for a given w_j and $\mathbf{U}$, $s_{b_1,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b_1,l}\} < 0$. Therefore,

$$\frac{s_{b_1,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b_1,l}\}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}|w_j|} < 0.$$

Hence,

$$Q\left(\frac{s_{b_1,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b_1,l}\}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}|w_j|}\right) > \frac{1}{2}. \tag{18}$$

Moreover, if there exists a b_1 such that (18) is true, then there also exists a $\bar{b}_1$ where each bit in $\mathbf{s}_{b_1}$ is inverted. For $b = \bar{b}_1$ we also have $Q\left(\frac{s_{\bar{b}_1,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{\bar{b}_1,l}\}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}|w_j|}\right) > \frac{1}{2}$, and therefore,

$$P_{e_j} > \frac{1}{N_b} + \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{\substack{b=1 \\ b\neq b_1,\bar{b}_1}}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}|w_j|}\right).$$

In other words, there always exists an error floor of $1/N_b$.

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF PROPERTY 1

Assuming $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $\mathbf{a}_0$ as

$$\mathbf{a}_0 = \alpha\mathbf{a}_1 + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{a}_2.$$

We also define the function $g(\mathbf{a})$ to denote the argument of the Q-function in (5). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{a}_0) &= \frac{\|\mathbf{h}_j\| a_{0j}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}} + \frac{\sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l\neq j}}^{K} \mathrm{Re}\{\bar{\mathbf{u}}_j^H \mathbf{h}_j^H \mathbf{h}_j \bar{\mathbf{u}}_l s_{b,l} s_{b,j}(a_{0l})\}}{\frac{\sigma_z}{\sqrt{2}}\|\mathbf{h}_j\|} \\ &= \alpha g(\mathbf{a}_1) + (1-\alpha) g(\mathbf{a}_2), \end{aligned}$$

which means that the argument of each Q-function in (5) is affine with respect to $\mathbf{a}$. Now, considering the fact that Q-function is convex over positive arguments and that affine mapping

does not change the convexity it becomes clear that $Q(g(\mathbf{a}))$ is a convex function [33]. Taking into account that the sum of two convex functions is a convex function it could be inferred that (5), i.e., the objective function of (6), is convex with respect to $\mathbf{a}$.

It is obvious that the constraint (6b) is a convex set with respect to $\mathbf{a}$ since it represents the volume inside of a K-dimensional sphere. By using the definition of a convex set [33], it could be shown that the constraints in (6c) are also convex sets with respect to $\mathbf{a}$. Also as mentioned earlier, the constraints defined in (6d) are not included in Minimization 2. Therefore, Minimization 2 of Table I is a convex optimization problem with a convex objective function and closed convex constraints.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

The minimization problem is considered over the following feasible set:

$$\mathcal{F}_j = \{w_j : |w_j| = 1, s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\} \geq 0, 1 \leq b \leq N_b\}. \tag{19}$$

Assume that $w_{j_1} \in \mathcal{F}_j$ is a global minimizer of the optimization problem (8), and $w_{j_2} \in \mathcal{F}_j$ is a local minimizer of the problem such that

$$P_{e_j}(w_{j_1}) < P_{e_j}(w_{j_2}). \tag{20}$$

Assuming $0 < \alpha < 1$, we define w_{j_0} as

$$w_{j_0} = \frac{\alpha w_{j_1} + (1-\alpha) w_{j_2}}{\|\alpha w_{j_1} + (1-\alpha) w_{j_2}\|}.$$

Therefore, we have $\|w_{j_0}\| = 1$, and for $1 \leq b \leq N_b$, we have $s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\left\{w_{j_0} \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\right\} \geq 0$. Hence, it can be inferred that $w_{j_0} \in \mathcal{F}_j$. It is also obvious that

$$\|\alpha w_{j_1} + (1-\alpha) w_{j_2}\| \leq \alpha \|w_{j_1}\| + (1-\alpha)\|w_{j_2}\| = 1.$$

Consequently,

$$s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\left\{w_{j_0} \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\right\} \geq \alpha s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\left\{w_{j_1} \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\right\} + (1-\alpha) s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\left\{w_{j_2} \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\right\}, \tag{21}$$

for $1 \leq b \leq N_b$. Therefore,

$$Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z}s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_{j_0}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\right) \leq$$
$$Q\left(\frac{\alpha s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_{j_1}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}+(1-\alpha)s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_{j_2}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_z^2}{2}}}\right)$$
$$\leq \alpha Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z}s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_{j_1}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\right)+$$
$$(1-\alpha)Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z}s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_{j_2}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\right) \tag{22}$$

where the first inequality is the result of (21) and due to the fact that $\mathrm{Q}(x)$ is a decreasing function for $x \geq 0$, and the second inequality stands because $\mathrm{Q}(x)$ is a convex function for $x \geq 0$.

From (1) and (22), it can be inferred that

$$P_{e_j}(w_{j_0}) = \frac{1}{N_b}\sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z|w_{j_0}|}s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_{j_0}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\right)$$
$$\leq \frac{\alpha}{N_b}\sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z|w_{j_1}|}s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_{j_1}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\right)+$$
$$\frac{1-\alpha}{N_b}\sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z|w_{j_2}|}s_{b,j}\mathrm{Re}\{w_{j_2}\sum_{l=1}^{K}\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\}\right)$$
$$= \alpha P_{e_j}(w_{j_1}) + (1-\alpha)P_{e_j}(w_{j_2}) < P_{e_j}(w_{j_2}), \quad \forall \alpha \in (0,1),$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that w_{j_1} is the global minimizer of $P_{e_j}(w_j)$. Now, let $\alpha \to 0$, $w_{j_0} \to w_{j_2}$. Hence, in a small neighborhood of w_{j_2}, there always exists a w_{j_0}, so that $P_{e_j}(w_{j_0}) < P_{e_j}(w_{j_2})$, i.e., w_{j_2} is not a local minimizer. In other words, there does not exist any local minimizer such that (20) holds. Therefore, it can be concluded that either no local minimizer exists, which proves the proposition, or there exists a local minimizer such that $P_{e_j}(w_{j_1}) \geq P_{e_j}(w_{j_2})$. However, since w_{j_1} is a global minimizer of $P_{e_j}(w_j)$, we have $P_{e_j}(w_{j_1}) \leq P_{e_j}(w_{j_2})$. Therefore, it can be concluded that $P_{e_j}(w_{j_1}) = P_{e_j}(w_{j_2})$, i.e., the local minimizer (if exists) is also a global minimizer.

To show the uniqueness of the global minimizer, first the following set is considered:

$$\mathcal{F}_j^0 = \{w_j : |w_j| = 1, \mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l\} = 0,\ 1 \le b \le N_b\}.$$

It is obvious that each point in this set is a global maximizer of error probability function in (1) constrained by the set defined in (19), because the arguments in all Q-functions in error probability will be zero. Therefore, to solve the minimization problem it is sufficient to solve the problem over the set $\mathcal{F}_j^1 = \mathcal{F}_j - \mathcal{F}_j^0$. $P_{e_j}(w_j)$ is strictly convex on $\mathcal{F}_k^1$, because $\mathrm{Q}(x)$ is strictly convex for $x > 0$. Assume that $w_{j_1} \neq w_{j_2}$ are two global minimizers of the optimization problem (8). We define w_{j_0} as follows:

$$w_{j_0} = \frac{\alpha w_{j_1} + (1-\alpha) w_{j_2}}{\|\alpha w_{j_1} + (1-\alpha) w_{j_2}\|}, \quad \forall \alpha \in (0,1).$$

Since w_{j_1} is a global minimizer, it is obvious that

$$P_{e_j}(w_{j_0}) \ge P_{e_j}(w_{j_1}). \tag{23}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$P_{e_j}(w_{j_0}) < \alpha P_{e_j}(w_{j_1}) + (1-\alpha) P_{e_j}(w_{j_2}) = P_{e_j}(w_{j_1}), \tag{24}$$

because $P_{e_j}(w_j)$ is strictly convex on $\mathcal{F}_j^1$. Since (24) contradicts (23), it can be inferred that the global minimizer is unique.

APPENDIX D
PROOF OF PROPERTY 4

Properties 2 and 3 and Propositions 1, and 2 show that without loss of generality $\min\limits_{w_j} P_{e_j}$ could be stated as (8) which does not have any local minimizer and has only one global minimizer. Problem (8) could be equivalently rewritten in the form of convex optimization problem as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w_j} \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z} s_{b,j} \mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l}\} \right) \\ \text{subject to} \quad |w_j| \le 1, \\ s_{b,j} \mathrm{Re}\left\{ w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j \mathbf{u}_l s_{b,l} \right\} \ge 0, \quad 1 \le b \le N_b, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

since $|w_j| \le 1$ is an active constraint.

APPENDIX E
PROOF OF PROPERTY 5

Before stating the proof it should be noted that the $\mathrm{Re}\{.\}$ operator is not a linear function. Assuming $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $\mathbf{U}_0$ as

$$\mathbf{U}_0 = \alpha \mathbf{U}_1 + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{U}_2.$$

We also define the function $g(\mathbf{U})$ to denote the argument of the Q-function in (9). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{U}_0) &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma_z} s_{b,j} \mathrm{Re}\{w_j \sum_{l=1}^{K} \mathbf{h}_j (\alpha \mathbf{u}_{1_l} + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{u}_{2_l}) s_{b,l}\} \\ &= \alpha g(\mathbf{U}_1) + (1-\alpha) g(\mathbf{U}_2), \end{aligned}$$

which means that the argument of each Q-function in (9a) is affine with respect to $\mathbf{U}$. Now, considering the fact that the Q-function is convex for positive arguments and that affine mapping does not change the convexity, $Q(g(\mathbf{U}))$ is a convex function [33]. Since the sum of two convex functions is a convex function it becomes clear that the objective function in (9), $P_e(\mathbf{U})$, is convex with respect to $\mathbf{U}$.

It is obvious that the constraint (9b) is a convex set with respect to $\mathbf{U}$ since $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^H) \leq 1$ represents the interior and boundary of a KM-dimensional ball. It is also interesting to note that $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^H) = \|\mathbf{U}\|_F^2$ and every norm is a convex function. The second constraint is not defined over $\mathbf{U}$ and the third constraint could be shown to be a convex set by using the definition. Therefore, problem (9) is a convex optimization problem over $\mathbf{U}$ with a convex objective function and closed convex constraints.

REFERENCES

[1] P. W. Wolniansky, G. J. Foschini, G. D. Golden, and R. A. Valenzuela, "V-blast: An architecture for realizing very high data rates over the rich-scattering wireless channel," in *Proc. URSI Int. Symp. Signals Sys. Elec (ISSSE)*, Oct. 1998, pp. 295–300.

[2] M. Schubert and H. Boche, "Solution of the multiuser downlink beamforming problem with individual SINR constraints," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 18–28, Jan. 2004.

[3] C. B. Peel, B. M. Hochwald, and A. L. Swindlehurst, "A vector-perturbation technique for near-capacity multiantenna multiuser communicationâĂŤpart I: Channel inversion and regularization," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 195–202, Jan. 2005.

[4] T. Yoo and A. Goldsmith, "On the optimality of multiantenna broadcast scheduling using zero-forcing beamforming," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 528–541, Mar. 2006.

[5] R. de Miguel and R. R. Müller, "On convex vector precoding for multiuser MIMO broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 4497–4508, Nov. 2009.

[6] M. Sadek, A. Tarighat, and A. H. Sayed, "A leakage-based precoding scheme for downlink multi-user MIMO channels," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 1711–1721, May 2007.

[7] R. H. Etkin, D. N. C. Tse, and H. Wang, "Gaussian interference channel capacity to within one bit," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 12, pp. 5534–5562, Dec. 2008.

[8] D. P. Palomar, J. M. Cioffi, and M. A. Lagunas, "Joint Tx-Rx beamforming design for multicarrier MIMO channels: A unified framework for convex optimization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 2381–2401, Sep. 2003.

[9] M. Bavand and S. D. Blostein, "Minimum probability of error multiuser transmit beamforming," in *Proc. Asilomar Conf. Signals, Syst. Comput.*, Nov. 2015, pp. 1247–1251.

[10] Q. Z. Ahmed, M.-S. Alouini, and S. Aissa, "Bit error-rate minimizing detector for amplify-and-forward relaying systems using generalized Gaussian kernel," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 55–58, Jan. 2013.

[11] S. Chen, N. N. Ahmad, and L. Hanzo, "Adaptive minimum bit error rate beamforming," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 341–348, Mar. 2005.

[12] N. Wang and S. D. Blostein, "Minimum BER transmit power allocation and beamforming for two-inputâĂŞmultiple-output spatial multiplexing systems," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 704–709, Mar. 2007.

[13] X. Wang, W.-S. Lu, and A. Antoniou, "Constrained minimum-BER multiuser detection," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 2903–2909, Oct. 2000.

[14] Q. H. Spencer, A. L. Swindlehurst, and M. Haardt, "Zero-forcing methods for downlink spatial multiplexing in multiuser MIMO channels," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 461–471, Feb. 2004.

[15] S. Abdallah and S. D. Blostein, "Rate adaptation using long range channel prediction based on discrete prolate spheroidal sequences," in *Proc. IEEE 15th Int. Workshop Signal. Process. Adv. Wireless Commun. (SPAWC)*, Jun. 2014, pp. 479–483.

[16] G. D. Forney Jr. and G. Ungerboeck, "Modulation and coding for linear gaussian channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 2384–2415, Oct. 1998.

[17] "LTE-M - optimizing LTE for the internet of things," *Nokia Network White Paper*, 2015.

[18] J. Mao, J. Gao, Y. Liu, and G. Xie, "Simplified semi-orthogonal user selection for MU-MIMO systems with ZFBF," vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 42–45, Feb. 2012.

[19] Z. Shen, R. Chen, J. G. Andrews, R. W. Heath Jr., and B. L. Evans, "Low complexity user selection algorithms for multiuser MIMO systems with block diagonalization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 3658–3663, Sep. 2006.

[20] A. Rajanna, , and N. Jindal, "Multiuser diversity in downlink channels: When does the feedback cost outweigh the spectral efficiency benefit?" *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 408–418, Jan. 2012.

[21] A. Zafar, M. Shaqfeh, M.-S. Alouini, and H. Alnuweiri, "A suboptimal scheme for multi-user scheduling in Gaussian broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 136–140, Feb. 2015.

[22] S. Huang, H. Yin, J. Wu, and V. C. M. Leung, "User selection for multiuser MIMO downlink with zero-forcing beamforming," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 3084–3097, Sep. 2013.

[23] A. Paulraj, R. Nabar, and D. Gore, *Introduction to Space-Time Wireless Communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[24] A. Konak, D. W. Coit, and A. E. Smith, "Multi-objective optimization using genetic algorithms: A tutorial," *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, vol. 91, no. 9, pp. 992–1007, Sep. 2006.

[25] E. Björnson, E. Jorswieck, M. Debbah, and B. Ottersten, "Multiobjective signal processing optimization: The way to balance conflicting metrics in 5G systems," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 14–23, Nov. 2014.

[26] H. Q. Ngo and E. G. Larsson, "Blind estimation of effective downlink channel gains in massive MIMO," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech, Signal Process. (ICASSP)*, Apr. 2015, pp. 2919–2923.

[27] H. Q. Ngo, A. Ashikhmin, H. Yang, E. G. Larsson, and T. L. Marzetta, "Cell-free massive MIMO: Uniformly great service for everyone," in *Proc. IEEE 16th Int. Workshop Signal. Process. Adv. Wireless Commun. (SPAWC)*, Jun. 2015, pp. 201–205.

[28] D. J. Love, R. W. Heath Jr., and T. Strohmer, "Grassmannian beamforming for multiple-input multiple-output wireless systems," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 2735–2747, Oct. 2003.

[29] J. H. Conway, R. H. Hardin, and N. A. Sloane, "Packing lines, planes, etc.: Packings in Grassmannian spaces," *Exper. Math.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 139–159, 1996.

[30] L. Zheng and D. N. C. Tse, "Communication on the Grassmann manifold: A geometric approach to the noncoherent multiple-antenna channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 359–383, Feb. 2002.

[31] R.-A. Pitaval, O. Tirkkonen, and S. D. Blostein, "Density and bounds for Grassmannian codes with chordal distance," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Info. Theory (ISIT)*, Aug. 2011, pp. 2298–2302.

[32] A. Barg and D. Y. Nogin, "Bounds on packings of spheres in the Grassmann manifold," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 2450–2454, Sep. 2002.

[33] S. Boyd, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.